EXHIBIT 4

	K2BEGENS	
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
4	V.	18 CR 183 (WHP)
5	NICHOLAS GENOVESE,	
6	Defendant.	
7	x	
8		New York, N.Y. February 11, 2020 2:30 p.m.
10	Before:	2.00 p.m.
11	HON. WILLIAM H. PAULEY III,	
12		District Judge
13		J
14	APPEARANCES	
15	GEOFFREY S. BERMAN United States Attorney for the	
16	Southern District of New York SAMSON ENZER	
17	Assistant United States Attorney	
18	ALEXANDER EISEMANN Attorney for Defendant	
19		
20		
21		
22 23		
24		
25		

MR. ENZER: Good afternoon, your Honor, Samson Enzer for government, and with me at counsel table is Special Agent Kristin Allain from the FBI.

I will also note for the record, and I have informed your Honor's deputy of this, there are several victims in the courtroom.

THE COURT: Thank you Mr. Enzer.

MR. EISEMANN: Good afternoon, your Honor, Alex Eisemann for the defendant, who is sitting beside me. And I'd also like to introduce the only person in the room that I know, who is my client's mother. She is sitting in the second row, in the black-and-white striped shirt, and she came from Chicago for this.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Eisemann. And I note the presence of the defendant, Nicholas Genovese, at counsel table.

This matter is on for sentencing. Are the parties ready to proceed?

MR. ENZER: Yes, your Honor.

MR. EISEMANN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Eisemann, have you reviewed the presentence investigation report with your client?

MR. EISEMANN: I did not review it him, but prior counsel, I guess Mr. Halperin represented to me that Mr.

Genovese has the report and has reviewed it. He's reviewed the recommendation as well. I didn't go over it personally because that was done long before I came into the case.

THE COURT: Are there any factual matters in the report that the defendant believes warrant modification or correction?

MR. EISEMANN: There are, your Honor, some technical things in there. One, if you have the report, paragraph 5.

THE COURT: Why don't take the podium. It will be much easier.

MR. EISEMANN: I think paragraph 5 is where we start. There is a restitution figure there and, as your Honor knows, the government and the defense have revised that figure.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. EISEMANN: The new figure is 11 point something million.

THE COURT: I'll physically change that in paragraph 5L and 5M.

MR. EISEMANN: All right. I'm going to paragraph 9 then. These are prepared by Mr. Halperin and I'm trying to make sure I'm understanding this particular one.

If I could have one moment.

The first sentence I'm going to tell you what the objection is and what I think it should read as. Which words I would change to do that are a little hard for me to go through

because it's not black lined.

The first sentence should read: During the relevant period, Genovese was the founder and manager, not a managing director, of the general partner of Willow Creek Investments, LP, which should be defined as not the Willow Creek hedge fund, but the partnership, or the limited partnership in guotes.

That's because the investment of the partnership's capital was through a hedge fund, which is a category of pool investment funds, so the suggestion is the term partnership or limited partnership should replace Willow Creek hedge fund there and throughout the PSR.

THE COURT: What about that, Mr. Enzer?

MR. ENZER: No objection.

MR. EISEMANN: Your Honor, if you would like, I can go through after the sentencing the PSR and highlight the areas so that you don't have to go through and find them, and I can send that to chambers.

THE COURT: That would be fine.

MR. EISEMANN: Paragraph 15. The first word of the third line of the third sentence should read "issuers," not "SEC."

THE COURT: That line should read: Issuers, notifying the SEC that the Willow Creek hedge fund intended to begin offering securities?

MR. EISEMANN: Give me one second to catch up with

you. It should be issuers notifying the SEC.

THE COURT: That's what I just said.

MR. EISEMANN: And the penultimate sentence should read: In the second form, Genovese marked the box for executive officer to identify his relationship with the issuer and further identified himself as the manager and general partner of Willow Creek Investments, LLP. As a technical thing I will make that change.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MR. ENZER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. EISEMANN: Paragraph 129 purports the sight -I'll let your Honor read it to yourself first, if that's
helpful.

THE COURT: You can proceed.

MR. EISEMANN: It purports to cite information from the private placement memorandum. For example, it identifies Grant Thornton as "the auditor of the Willow Creek hedge fund." However, that private placement memorandum identifies Grant Thornton as the accountant for both partnerships which "reserves the right to use other and additional firms for other audit services." That's in the private placement memorandum at 20.

In addition, the auditor subsection of the services provider section states that the partnership's books of account

shall be treated as of the close of each fiscal year by Grant
Thornton or any other independent accounting firm designated by
the general partner, and that's at the private placement memo
at 37.

So information concerning the amount of assets managed from the family of the Willow Creek investment advisor or number of employees employed at the various entities does not appear to be reported in the private placement memo, so the entire second sentence and the remainder of paragraph 19 should be deleted. Frankly, I am reading more than I am fully capturing it. Unless it's clear to your Honor, I would be willing to talk to Mr. Enzer about this and see whether we can reach agreement.

THE COURT: What's the government's view with respect to those changes and deleting the last sentence of paragraph 19?

MR. ENZER: The last sentence, Genovese managed 4 billion in assets?

THE COURT: Yes. That is the last sentence.

MR. ENZER: Can I confer with defense counsel for one second?

MR. EISEMANN: Your Honor, I think all these technical things, as we don't have some of the information we need, the government doesn't have it, they are technical, so is it possible to defer this and put a joint letter in saying what we

agree to be changed and what we agree not to be changed and try and set the argument so your Honor can just make a decision based on that joint letter, as opposed to calling us back in to argue about something.

THE COURT: Why weren't these issues raised with probation?

MR. EISEMANN: They apparently were raised only by -there were three main lawyers in here. There was Ed Little,
Jonathan Halperin, and there was me.

Ed Little raised one objection, which is in the presentence report and was addressed by the probation officer.

When Halperin took over the case, he looked and saw these technical things that weren't right and was planning on putting them in at the time of sentencing, and I adopted that as well. It's a little bit of a problem with handing off from one lawyer to the next.

THE COURT: There have been so many lawyers in the case.

MR. EISEMANN: At least when the main work was done there were three lawyers. And the handoff from the first lawyer, who didn't put in the objections the second lawyer thought should be put in, and I'm fairly agnostic about those things. I trust the work that they did. But because of doing this in court, the government is at a disadvantage because they don't have some of the documents saying that the private

placement memo is not consistent with. I don't think it's going to make a difference with a sentence, frankly, all the ones I have in front of me, so if you allow me to defer these late objections to following the sentencing, I think we can move forward on it. I don't think they will make a difference. None of them are material.

THE COURT: How many more are there? Just give me a summary.

MR. EISEMANN: The next one talks about --

THE COURT: Let's press ahead so that I know what the objections are.

MR. EISEMANN: OK. I'll give you a quick snapshot of what they are. Paragraph 32 has something about the restitution figure which has been corrected. Your Honor's going to correct that with my assistance.

There's an issue about -- I addressed this in my sentencing memorandum, the second letter I just put in. It is about Colony Hills Capital. It's a civil litigant and should be struck from the PSR because their funds were returned, so they shouldn't be included. That's paragraph 32 to 38 under the victim impacts. It's all before your Honor as to what happened.

THE COURT: Let me inquire of the government. With respect to victim impact relating to Colony Hills Capital, what does the government want to do with that?

MR. ENZER: I don't have an objection to it being removed from the PSR, which is the immediate issue before the Court.

The broader issue of whether Colony Hills should be treated as a victim for restitution is something that is not clear yet. I have conferred with their counsel, but there is an open issue between us and between the defense as to whether they, A, are a restitution victim, and if so, B, what is the right amount of any restitution loss that they should be getting a recovery for.

THE COURT: But it seems to me for an entity to say that they forewent other opportunities is, one, rather speculative and, two, the defendant pled guilty in October of 2018. If it's not worked out by the time of sentencing, when is it going to be worked out?

MR. EISEMANN: It's a restitution issue.

THE COURT: Lawyers love to put restitution over. Oh, Judge, we'll take care of it another time. It really doesn't work that way. I guess I'm going to let it work that way in this case because it's been such a struggle to get Mr. Genovese to sentencing.

So I'm going to strike paragraphs 33 through 38 from the presentence report.

MR. EISEMANN: I think also the end of paragraph 32 where it says: To date one victim Colony Hills Capital.

25

means.

1 THE COURT: No. That's an accurate statement. Their law firm sent a letter to me. 2 3 MR. EISEMANN: One claimed victim then? Unless you're 4 going to adopt that they are, in fact, a victim of the offense. 5 THE COURT: No. I'm leaving it the way it is. 6 MR. EISEMANN: OK. 7 THE COURT: That objection is overruled. MR. EISEMANN: Paragraph 109, your Honor, talks about 8 9 Mr. Genovese's health. It lists some problems with him. 10 says: Otherwise is in good health. But he has other problems 11 that I've described in the submissions that you have and I'm 12 going to amplify them a little bit here today as well. If you 13 said, suffers at least from sinuses asthma, and struck the last 14 sentence, he's otherwise in good health, that would be 15 accurate. Any objection? 16 THE COURT: 17 MR. ENZER: No, your Honor. 18 THE COURT: All right. I'm making those changes to 19 paragraph 109. 20 MR. EISEMANN: In the criminal history, to the extent 21 that -- this is paragraph 81 and going forward. 22 THE COURT: Hold on. Go ahead. 23 MR. EISEMANN: In looking at paragraph 83 and 84, for 24 example, stricken off, leave reinstated, I don't know what that

I propose that notations be taken out of the report and

25

1 just leave it blank. 2 MR. ENZER: No objection. 3 THE COURT: All right. Those notations are stricken at paragraphs 83 and 85. 4 5 MR. EISEMANN: Believe it or not your Honor, that's 6 it. 7 THE COURT: All right. MR. EISEMANN: The other ones, I'll write a letter and 8 9 try and get the government's cooperation to be clear of what it 10 is that we agree upon. I expect they'll probably agree on 11 these things. If not, I'll highlight the area of disagreement 12 and give it to your Honor to decide that on submission. 13 THE COURT: We've covered in substance the objections, 14 right? 15 MR. EISEMANN: Yes. THE COURT: OK. You'll submit such a letter to me by 16 17 February 18, next Tuesday. 18 Mr. Enzer, are there any factual matters set forth in 19 the presentence investigation report that the government 20 believes warrant modification or correction? 21 MR. ENZER: No, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. Now, with respect to this 23 sentencing, I plan to proceed as follows: 24 First, I intend to hear from any victim who wishes to

address the Court. After that, I'll entertain argument from

defense counsel and then the government concerning sentencing and the 3553(a) factors. Finally, I will hear from the defendant, Mr. Genovese, if he wishes to address the Court.

So at this time I'm informed by the government that there are victims who wish to come forward and address the Court.

At this time I would call on Mitchell Levine to come forward to the podium.

Good afternoon, sir. If you could just state your name for the record.

MR. LEVINE: Mitchell Levine.

Thank you for the opportunity to make a statement regarding Nicholas Genovese, my relationship to him. I did submit a written statement which I assume that you have some familiarity with.

THE COURT: I have received that, yes.

MR. LEVINE: Thank you.

I just would like to give a little background on how I came to know Mr. Genovese and why I think he should be sentenced to the maximum that the law allows.

I actually came to meet Mr. Genovese through my hospital. I work at Lenox Hill Hospital. I'm a neurosurgeon in the department of neurosurgery. I received an email, which I'll just quickly read, which comes from an official email from my company email saying: Hi, everyone. I want to thank you

for taking time out to meet with my friend tomorrow. I share some of the amazing things we do at Lenox Hill Hospital with him, and he requested to consider neurosurgery for philanthropy. He is interested and that's why I want to organize a hospital OR tour for him, him being Nicholas Genovese, and then spend some time sharing our key projects that can benefit from philanthropy. This was sent by an administrator in the neurosurgery department.

It says: Below is a short bio. This is, I think, what speaks to the fraud. It says: Nicholas Genovese, managing director and founder of Willow Creek Advisors LLC, is the main portfolio manager analyst who is primarily responsible for all of Willow Creek funds.

Mr. Genovese was a partner at Goldman Sachs, and prior to that was a portfolio manager and member of the investment strategy committee at Bear Sterns. He received a BS in finance from the University of Kentucky and an MBA in finance from Dartmouth Tuck Business School. We will send an agenda shortly. Please let me know if you have any objections.

This came to me through my official email from my hospital. We subsequently had a meeting with Mr. Genovese which was attended by myself and four of my colleagues in my department and the development office from Northwell Health and its Lenox Hill point person, so to speak, where we all talked with Mr. Genovese, and he presented himself as a manager of a

very successful hedge fund with a lot of money.

He also stated — because we asked him why, all of a sudden, is he giving us money. And he made the point that the charitable donations of his sizeable family charities were previously given to Salvation Army and that he wanted to divert some of these funds to a department where it would have a big impact, which makes sense. Because as a neurosurgery department, the proposed gift of about \$5 million would have been a transformative gift in terms of allowing us to endow chairs and further our academic mission.

So, from that point onward I started a relationship with Mr. Genovese, which he cultivated, and, to me, just not getting into the details, this was like quite a good con, if you had to say, the con being he presents himself as a prominent donor. He has this completely set of false credentials.

Whether he knew it or not, in the philanthropy business, because I went over this with my hospital, they do very little due diligence. They don't check that Nicholas Genovese really had all this money. They don't do any background check. They don't run the social security number. They do nothing.

And they are perfectly willing to take his money, which I didn't know about the lack of due diligence, but I think Nicholas did. And he then went along this path as

presenting himself as a potential donor.

We treated him like royalty, obviously, because he was giving us a lot of money. We gave him private tours of the hospital. I took him to my laboratory and showed him my laboratory and scientists and all the good work that we are doing. And all this was done with the thought that he was who he said he was. It wasn't as if we were looking for a hedge fund to throw some money into and make more money. We were doing this as a source of philanthropy.

Through that, it validated in my mind that this guy was who he said he was. I am very naive and in my own head I was thinking, if Northwell Health believes him and they are pursuing them and made him an honored guest at our fundraising gala — I believe he was actually in Florida, where he was apprehended, to attend a Northwell event. I'm not sure. I can't speak to that directly.

Essentially, what he did was he used that position as a potential donor, which went on and on for a long time, including letters of intent between his attorneys to give money to the hospital, which never materialized or always kind of delays that the money never came. But during that entire period, I stayed involved with him and he gained my trust and we became friends, I guess, and I was naive.

At some point, in terms of the fraud, he offered to me to buy shares in a pre-IPO, Pinterest investment. And he said

that if I invested \$500,000, which is a hell of a lot of money for me, I've never done anything like this before ever, all my money has been managed by real money managers, and that was a lot of money for me, that I would get pre-IPO shares in Pinterest.

And, unfortunately, I did do due diligence, but not into Nicholas Genovese. I did due diligence into Pinterest and whether it's a good investment or not. And I found out it's a very good investment and it was rare for private individuals to get pre-IPO shares, and he explained to me how he was getting \$20 million worth of shares, this transfer of shares of Willow Creek, and he would then, because he liked me kind of, allow me to invest this money, and my friend invested a million dollars.

And basically he took this money for pre-IPO shares, which was a total fraud. He didn't have pre-IPO shares. He wasn't legally able to sell pre-IPO shares. This was a complete fraud.

It's not like he lost money. He took money to sell something like selling the Brooklyn Bridge. He didn't own it, he didn't have the shares. It was a complete 100 percent fraud. When I asked him about it, I said: Why don't I get certificates? Why don't I have some legal piece of paper saying I own these shares? He said: No. At Willow Creek everything is held in Willow Creek, and I logged onto my account and I saw there is money listed for Pinterest. But in

the end, it was an absolute 100 percent fraud. He had no shares. He had no access to shares. It was a complete fraud.

The next fraud that came about was that he started asking me, persistently asking about, what are you doing with your -- don't you have any cash? What are you doing with your money? Where is your IRA money? I mentioned to him that I had my IRA money with Schwab and that it was in cash. I kept it in cash. And why would I keep it in cash? Because I was scared. I actually kept it in cash. It wasn't even making any money. Because after 2008, I lost money, so I took a big portion of it and I went to cash, and I left it there as my security.

Well, Nick worked on me and worked on me and worked on me. And the sad part of it is, I gave him \$1.4 million. Not to him, theoretically, but to this, to the Willow Creek IRA fund. And my thinking was, I had some money with Schwab, my other investment, I would diversify a little bit. I thought he was a real guy. He told me about his returns on his investment. It seemed like a real IRA, according to his literature, and my accountant asked me -- yeah. I said that's fine. It's an IRA rollover. No problem. You can do that. He said, I don't advise it because I don't know this guy, but just make sure he's a legal custodian, make sure he's legally able to have an IRA custodial account, or else the government, when you withdraw that money, is going to take that as a cash withdrawal.

And I spoke to Nick and I have in writing his response: Of course I'm a legal custodian. Of course I'm good. Of course the government lets me do this. How can I run an IRA? How can I run an IRA account without being a legal custodian? That's the next fraud.

He was never a legal custodian. He had no right to run an IRA. The IRA money was viewed by the government as a cash disbursal. And I had to pay another \$253,000 in tax to New York State because of that disbursal. My tax attorney took the position that it was a tax fraud loss, which is recognized by the IRS but not by New York State and New York City. So in the case it cost me another \$253,000, and that was his fraud. His fraud was that he was the IRA custodian and this was an IRA account and it wasn't. It was just nothing. He was not in any way registered, he had no right to take IRA money, and the government views it — even though I was defrauded and it's a crime, the IRS and their attorneys and the law is, they felt sorry for me, but you still owe the money. Those were the two main frauds that were placed on me, so my total loss with him was well over \$2 million.

And in terms of the IRA money, that was money that I contributed to since 1983. I've been a neurosurgeon for many years. I'm 68 years old now. I started when I was 31. And every year I put \$30,000 into this account, \$30,000, \$30,000. This isn't money I made in some deal. This wasn't money I made

a couple weeks ago when I sold a building and got all this money and give it to this fund. This was money that accrued over 25, 30 years of work and that because of the stock market and the way it was invested, it grew, as it should have grown.

And that's what he took from me. He took my life savings from me, money that was hard earned and incrementally earned. I didn't do a good deal and just put the money to him.

In the end, my sad story -- and I don't now how much this impacts on things, but I was recently diagnosed with cancer. I underwent -- part of reason I'm speaking this way is the left side of my face doesn't work. I had malignant cancer in my salivary glands discovered shortly after I found out about this fraud, so 2018 was not a particularly good year for me.

I had extensive surgery, radiation, chemotherapy at MD Anderson Cancer Center. I was out of work for six months.

Luckily, this past January I was able to return part time to work. But what I can't do, I don't have a future that's going to recoup this money.

Unfortunately, this past December, my cancer returned. I have terminal cancer right now. It's difficult for me to be here. Yesterday I had to go to extensive treatments at Sloan Kettering. Radiation, immunotherapy. My survival is quite uncertain.

And in planning my estate planning, which I had to do,

it's clear that \$2 million taken out of my estate, to my children and my wife my family is a big hit. It's a major part of my money. It's less for my children. It's not going to affect me. It's going to affect my family. I'm not going to be here very long.

But I expect from the Court and what I want from the Court is, I have no chance of recouping this money. If I was well and healthy over the next 10 years, I could probably make it back, but I'm not going make it back. It's a loss.

And what I'm asking from the Court is this a predator, this is a con man, this is a fraud. He took my money. He knew that the IRA money was not good. He knew that the Pinterest shares were not real. It's not a question of him losing a lot of money trading. It's a matter of him taking the money on a fraudulent basis. His credentials were completely fraudulent. He reiterated to me over and over again, when he was at Goldman Sachs, when he was at Bear Sterns. He wore a Dartmouth cap all the time.

This is a complete fraud and I think he should be punished as such. My goal of being here is less about getting money back, but protecting society from the predatory behavior of a man like him. I couldn't imagine a person to be this evil. It's beyond my imagination to think that someone could be so without conscious and such a sociopath and befriend people, run this con, take the money, and have no remorse

nothing.

That's my statement. I want the government to protect the citizens of the United States from future actions of this predator. That's my goal. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Dr. Levine.

At this time I would call on Granville Beals to come forward.

MR. BEALS: Thank you, your Honor, and the Court for allowing me to speak. My name is Granville Aimes Beals.

I will be 65 in April, and I am a victim, also, of a life-altering terrible fraud inflicted upon me, my wife, and many other decent people by Nicholas Genovese, who I met nearly eight years ago on a flight to New York. He then shared with me his position as an heir to the Genovese drugstore chain family fortune, his time as a partner at Goldman Sachs, with Bear Sterns as a portfolio manager, as well as his Dartmouth college days etc., all leading up to his managing the family's fortune with his multibillion dollar hedge fund, Willow Creek Advisors.

He told me about his home that he had in a very tony part of Greenwich, Connecticut and his polo pony, which he had purchased in Kentucky for his sport that he so loved to watch, as well as play. He was impeccably dressed in a fine suit, Gucci shoes, Rolex watch. He certainly fit the part.

So what's a billionaire doing sitting next to me I

asked him. Without missing a beat, he explained it was a last-minute booking that his secretary had made for him and that no first-class seats were available. It's a short connecting flight, so that seemed pretty reasonable to me. But as I would later learn, that was all just a mountain of unscrupulous deception and emotional manipulation.

He had law offices which are down at 1 Liberty Plaza with spectacular views of Wall Street and lots of beautifully printed pamphlets. There's a lot of stuff in here that I got suckered into. He had brochures and marketing materials extolling Willow Creek Advisors.

He had a private, armed, salaried driver, former NYPD, armed, sitting in his Cadillac out front waiting to whisk him around. His other cars, a Bentley and Mercedes, were primarily for his personal use. So after a long workday chances are good that he'd be driven to the Four Seasons for cocktails, where he was well known by the attentive staff, who always treated him like royalty.

He lived an extravagant lifestyle, which he always justified for me for all the hard work that he was doing on a daily basis to manage his clients and his family's money.

On his occasional business trips to California, which is where I live, he told me that he was there to meet with executives at Google and Apple about investments they were making, or had already made, with Willow Creek Advisors and to

meet with his Los Angeles clients, which included the prestigious Kerkorian and Chandler families, to name a few.

He would always stay at the Ritz-Carlton on the VIP club level, and he would either drive himself to our house in a Maserati, or arrive in a large Suburban with his two armed off-duty LAPD security men.

He often told us that he was very hands on and his clients always come first. This, along with all of his other well-documented fabrications, was just a huge lie, a lie which was revealed to us on the evening of February 2, 2018, while we were parked outside of a house where we would be attending a dear friend's 60th birthday party.

I attempted for over a week to reach Mr. Genovese without success. I spoke to him frequently, texted him almost daily. And alarmed that I had not heard a word from him in response to the numerous messages that I had left him, I was truly quite concerned about his safety, and I thought well maybe he had been in a terrible car accident or was in the hospital.

So while sitting with my wife in our car, I searched the news online. And that's when I learned that he had just been apprehended and arrested in Florida by the FBI. My wife and I, we just sat that in our car just staring at each other, in a state of shock, an unfamiliar panic. It was a horrible moment where right away we felt a terrifying sense of the harsh

and devastating effects this would no doubt have on our life.

Our life savings from years of hard work was stolen. With that stunning revelation we went in to celebrate our friend's 60th birthday.

The anxiety brought on by the loss of our savings is enormous. The burden which has been placed upon us by this calculating criminal is immeasurable. Money that we thought was wisely invested and growing is gone, stolen.

It's hard for us not to feel like fools, even though we know well we are victims of a horrible crime. And as much as we've tried to put it behind us, this nightmare, the damage that he has inflicted upon our life makes that quite impossible. Our finances and future plans for a safe and secure retirement are shattered. It scares us to think what life's going to be like from here on out.

He's proven himself to be a serial thief of others' life savings. There is no remorse. There is just a hibernation period in prison, eating, sleeping and requiring public staffing, plenty of time for him to plot what's next on our dime again.

We were not shot with a gun. We were not stabbed with a knife. We were not bludgeoned with a hammer or a club. But make no mistake. My wife and I were stalked and attacked as were all the other good people who believed that Nicholas Genovese was a trusted financial advisor and truly caring

friend with nothing but the best interests in mind for our financial well being. His despicable crimes, although bloodless, are maliciously aggressive, leaving gaping wounds that last a lifetime.

A disturbing example of how much he cared. Greeting cards and flowers my wife would receive from for the good news I would share about your her bimonthly checkups following the surgery and chemotherapy treatments she had gone through for ovarian cancer. It's blatantly obvious that his motivation for these kind and loving gestures had nothing whatsoever to do with any care or concern for the health and welfare of my wife. Excuse me.

It is a despicable example of his cunning manipulations, and I'm disgusted, as is she, by the pretense of care and concern showed to her by our, quote, friend Nicholas Genovese, when in truth he couldn't care less.

If that wasn't enough, she lost her job of 19 years just one week before learning that our financial caretaker is an ex con and our money's gone. His calculated plan was to take us for all he could. We were just another couple of perfectly targeted victims to exploit in the big con game that has been his sole vocation for the entirety of his adult life, one that led to numerous felony convictions for fraud-related offenses, including forgery, theft by deception, identity theft, grand larceny three times, along with time spent in

prison.

And, still, he has not change his criminal ways. He has flagrantly broken our laws and our trust. He is not ignorant. Oh, no. He is blatantly dishonest and brutally predatory. He steals, he lies, he manipulates and, most of all, he leaves people in ruin, people who uphold our laws and believe in our civilization, people who have worked hard all of their lives, only to have him promise that he will put that hard-earned money to work while actually stealing it.

In February of 2017, roughly a year before Mr.

Genovese was arrested, we were notified by the IRS that someone had attempted to impersonate us, using our name and social security numbers to file an early tax return, requesting that the refund be wired in an expedited manner. We've never filed early or requested an expedited return in our 29 years of filing our joint tax returns. Thankfully the IRS noticed this and contacted us first. We were victims of identity theft.

Once again, we stood to lose even more of our money. Perhaps it's no coincidence that this is a felony crime for which

Nicholas Genovese has previously been convicted, given what he has done to us. I think not.

There's not punishment enough for all the suffering that he has caused. He has proven himself to be a danger to society, whose lavish lifestyle derived from a lifetime of crime, which suits him just fine.

I'm well aware that Nicholas Genovese has made a plea deal and no doubt expects to receive a sentence agreeable to him. He's a master manipulator and his manipulations have not ceased, even during his incarceration.

After pleading guilty, he delayed the sentencing over and over and over again, going through multiple attorneys, getting sick, needing more time, over and over again to prepare, prepare. Prepare for what? He's guilty. The numerous crimes that he has committed are plain-as-day facts, and yet his games and manipulations continue. He has dragged this out, inflicting further abuse upon his victims and upon this court.

I have lost count of how many times I have forfeited money for canceled tickets that I have purchased for flights to attend this sentencing. I submit he was just employing one of the many techniques in his playbook, counting on victims, such as myself, who have gone out of their way to speak in court to become so frustrated that they finally give up and decide not to appear for this sentencing.

He may not be too worried. Well, I am. I am worried that my retirement years, which are just around the corner, will be fraught with financial insecurity. I'm worried that our healthcare expenses might be unaffordable when we need it most. I worry about things I never would have worried about were it not for Nicholas Genovese.

Well, I have a plea too. And that plea is that
Nicholas Genovese be given a sentence that meets, at the very
least, a maximum allowed by the guideline set forth for the
plea that he agreed to. I plea for more, in fact. He stole
freedom from our retirement years. Why should he someday be
free to enjoy his life. May he never experience true freedom
again and may he forever be prevented from bringing harm to
another individual. He does not deserve anything from this
community. It is the community that deserves protection from
him.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Beals.

I call now on Mr. Orley to come forward.

MR. ORLEY: Thank you. My name is Geoff Orley.

I find no reason to repeat what the prior two victims have already said. I can't agree more. I was a little dismayed that the proposed sentencing guidelines were only 10 to 13 years, which was a surprisingly light sentence to me.

On the other hand, I have been in court now in the civil court trying to find a way to recover some of my hard-earned monies and, unfortunately, there's nothing to recover from Mr. Genovese. I'm trying to win a suit against his attorney, Mr. Schiavetta, who the Court acknowledged did have scienter, but I now need to prove that Mr. Genovese had funds in the account at the time of the fraud.

And because of the grand jury and other reasons, I've been unable to attain paperwork to help prove that the funds were in the account, so I have a potential opportunity maybe to recover something in a civil court. His attorney did mention they had paperwork, maybe it can help me. I don't know if there is something that can help.

But I can say that I tried to have a personal relationship with Nick. We had a personal relationship. He went with me on a trip to South America. And as we were riding horses he was talking about all of the funds he was making on the telephone up in the mountains to his attorney or his other partner in crime that I could just hear enough to salivate and be excited about the opportunities that he was creating.

But, unfortunately, I was duped like the others. I was also naive. My MBA son doesn't even want to talk to me anymore. He doesn't trust in my judgment.

And, unfortunately, I introduced Nick to my family, to my friends. He slept in my house. And outside of the loss in Willow creek, I advanced monies for us to take a fishing trip together in the Amazon, which to this date he never paid for and I had to pay for out of my pocket and never took the trip, in addition to the loss in Willow creek.

Everything was a lie. Everything was a fraud, everything, including going to see his horses out in Greenwich with the sign over his booth at center court, and,

unfortunately, it was all bullshit. The restaurant that we celebrated his birthday in, knew the matrie d' and everybody knew him and knew his mother and knew this and that, and I was just another naive victim that he took advantage of.

I'm hoping I might have a recovery in the civil court, but I'm not too optimistic, and I only ask the judge to do what he thinks is correct. But Nick should not be out on the streets with an opportunity to go after more people. I know he likes pinstriped suits and I see he's not wearing one today. Maybe he'll never get to wear one, I hope not, unless that's the order of the prison.

So thank you for your time, and he deserves everything he's got coming.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you Mr. Orley.

I now call on Mr. Blank to come forward.

MR. BLANK: Thank you for this opportunity allowing me to read my statement.

THE COURT: Would you just state your full name for the record.

MR. BLANK: Aaron David Blank.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. BLANK: What my fellow victims have said, it pales in what I have to say here, so I'm going to cut to the chase a little bit.

This is what I have to show for my grandfather,

working almost to his dying day and giving me a meager inheritance that was then swindled away from me by a fast-talking con man.

It breaks my heart more that he also most probably defrauded my most favorite institution, the Metropolitan Opera. And more disgusting, I am very certain he used those funds to hire prostitutes, which breaks my heart and my family's legacy.

This whole affair has made me extremely distrustful of everyone. I've suffered from a great depression from it. I ask to you please exercise no leniency.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Blank.

Are there any other victims in the courtroom who wish to come forward and address the Court?

MR. ENZER: No.

THE COURT: Seeing no one coming to their feet, I'll turn now, Mr. Eisemann, to you. Do you want to be heard?

MR. EISEMANN: I do. Can I have just a minute to look at -- my client has made some notes while the victims were talking.

THE COURT: Take a moment.

MR. EISEMANN: Thank you, your Honor.

First, just as a housekeeping matter, I have the signature page of Mr. Genovese's letter to your Honor, which I'm going to hand up to you.

THE COURT: That's fine. But please take the podium in addressing the Court.

MR. EISEMANN: I'm going to start with reacting to the painful statements that you just heard from the victims.

I mean, there is no getting away from the fact that this crime, like every economic crime, is painful and tragic.

And when I hear something like Dr. Levine's diagnosis and think that he has to go through this while he's going through that, and the other problems that people talk about -- and I do want to address some of that on the merits.

But their anger and their sense of betrayal is understandable. This was their friend. And despite the suspicion, the understandable suspicions that it seems like that's all part of the manipulation, Mr. Genovese has written your Honor about how these were real friendships to him, and you have a report that talks about how this filled a need in him.

So it's a complicated situation. If I were in the victims' shoes, I would be saying just what they said. I wouldn't expect them to try to take a broader view, which is obviously your Honor's responsibility here because you are not just going to go by what the victims say. Otherwise, everyone would go to jail forever.

Mr. Genovese, as one of the speakers noted, didn't hurt anyone and, obviously, there has to be some measured

sentence because your Honor sentences not just people who affected the victims in this case, but across all spectrums of the crimes that come before a federal judge, and there are norms that have developed out there as well, and I briefed your Honor somewhat on that. I'll talk about that.

But it's difficult. I won't envy your Honor sitting in the position if you decide that under the guidelines and just the legal analysis that you have before you that something less than the guidelines is warranted. It's not going to be easy to do that with the victims here, who don't fully understand why you might do that, but, obviously, that's your job and that's the responsibility that's given to you as an Article III judge with lifetime tenure. You have to make those judgments.

And anyone who is a judge or wants to be a judge knows that people are always going to be angry when they leave the courtroom if they didn't win, if they didn't get what they expected; but, hopefully, with your Honor's explanation and hearing my presentation, will at least let the people who have been betrayed understand that there is a another side to the person before your Honor. I am not taking away from what he did, but the guidelines recommend a certain sentence. They are mechanical. They are criticized. People who have stolen far more got lower sentences, so your Honor has to fit this case in with the matrix of all the cases that are out there and not

just react to what is heartfelt, painful to listen to, and, frankly, difficult for me to respond to the statements from the victims.

I will comment on them to get it out of the way, and
I'm not sure that any victim will be happy with the
countervailing facts I'm trying to put on the table, but it's
my job and I'm going to do that.

When Dr. Levine was talking -- well, just generally, there is no excuse -- I'm going to say this many times, probably -- for the untruths that Mr. Genovese told these people to get them to invest. My memorandum, the submissions I've made, the letter from Mr. Genovese, make clear something which I don't think anyone can refute, and that is that he did that as -- in his mind it was a threshold issue, and then he thought he would make money. He didn't make money. But he didn't intend to steal their money. They feel that way. I understand it. But the objective facts are that he invested the money. Maybe he didn't do it very well. Maybe there are other people who could have done better, but he did invest and that's a mitigating factor that your Honor has to consider, as I briefed in my submissions.

It's not as if he's a person who -- people lost \$11.2 million, the loss figure here -- because he said, how can I get that money into my pocket so I can have \$11.2 million. He didn't do that. He said, how could I get \$11.2 million so I

can invest it because I think -- and there's a lot of support for why he thought that way -- I think I'm a talented investor, and I'll make them money -- because I'm leveraging other people's money, I'll make money as well.

He lost it all. Other hedge funds went belly up. I have the names of them. Maybe other hedge funds wouldn't have gone belly up. But to the victims who feel betrayed, if your Honor does, to a more measured approach under the guidelines, by talking to your Honor, I want them to understand that as well that there is a difference between — as bad as what Mr. Genovese did, a difference between someone who said, and there are many of them and your Honor has sentenced them, who started from the getgo to say how can I fleece these people and put it in my pocket. He didn't do that. He put some in his pocket. He lived a higher lifestyle than he should have, but he didn't start out to do that.

Just in the order of my notes, Mr. Beals saying that he felt that Mr. Genovese wasn't a caring friend. With all due respect, he doesn't know whether that's a case or not.

Perfectly reasonable assumption for him to make. It was all part of a manipulation. I don't think your Honor is going to be able to resolve that.

You have Mr. Genovese's letter talking about how he feels pained by what he did to people who were his friends. I think we have to leave it at that, that there are two sides to

the story.

But because he invested money, I think you can't make the leap of logic to say that everything he did, all the friendship he showed, all the times they had together that they felt warmth with each other it was all a betrayal -- sorry -- it was all a manipulation. I just don't think anybody knows that. The only person that really knows that is Mr. Genovese. But there is objective evidence showing that his statements that it wasn't like that are backed up by the record of him trading and how he has talked in his heartfelt letter about the impact he feels about what he did.

By the way, Mr. Beals, I just would like to tell him something through your Honor. The canceled sentencing hearings, at least on my watch, were not done by any instructions by Mr. Genovese. That's my own workload and what I had to do. The last time we adjourned the sentence I learned — only when I was making the 11th-hour request to adjourn it, that's when I learned that victims were coming in here to speak.

And if your Honor remembers, at that hearing I said I will make this a firm date. I don't want to inconvenience the victims. I will try to look into whether they could actually be compensated by the victim funds for the cost of their airfare.

But to Mr. Beals I want you to know -- I am not going

to turn around and face him, because I can only speak to your

Honor — that that was on me and not on my client, and I

apologize to the extent you had to do that. For my time I

don't know the answers, but most adjournments are done because

lawyers need them, not because the clients are asking for the

lawyers to get them.

Mr. Orley says that when they took a trip to Colombia that Mr. Genovese was talking about the money he was making while he was on top of a mountain. Your Honor knows -- I didn't give you all the records going back, but there were times when he was making money, and he made some very good deals. He turned \$50,000, \$51,000 into about \$600,000 in a matter of days.

So, again, it's one of these things we don't know. I could go back forensically and reconstruct the date of the trip and say that, look, he did actually make money there, but he was actually working this fund. Despite how he got the money to invest, he was working the fund with analysts, with reports, with keeping up with news, keeping up with social media. They developed algorithms to be able to pick their stocks.

They did not work out for sure, but it's just a little bridge too far to say that everything he did was a concoction, because it wasn't, and the record establishes that.

So justifiable anger should go as far as the justifiable anger is deserved, and it's well deserved because

the impact of this is that they've lost their money. And who cares whether Mr. Genovese thought he was going to make money or not. To them they lost their money, and they are going to bring that to your Honor's attention and talk about how painful it is, and there is no doubt about it.

That's why Mr. Genovese is going to go to jail and not walk out a free man, as somebody who nobody lost money on might do, or as someone who had a much lower degree of crime will do. But he won't spend the rest of his life in prison, as someone who has murdered people have done or who ran a huge drug ring and probably resulted in deaths of many people. There is a continuum, and he is in the continuum, but only at a certain level.

All of the investors signed -- all of them talk about the impact of losing money, and there is no doubt that losing a million or \$2 million is painful, unless you are Mike Bloomberg. To anybody who has got a modest amount of money it's painful.

But all of them did sign subscription agreements that said -- it looks like boiler plate, but it means something -- that the fund has no track record, that they need to be prepared to lose their money. There are regulations that determine who can invest in a hedge fund and that's what goes into these subscription agreements that say you got to have at least X amount of income, this much assets. I may have

reached, your Honor, on the numbers, but if not, it's in the regulations. You have to be a qualified investor, one who acknowledges that you can lose the money.

Certainly, nobody agrees to lose money because of deception. But to the extent that any of the victims here are testifying that this has made an impact on their life, again, I'm not saying it doesn't make an impact.

But to the extent that other information I have or things that people wrote in subscription agreements or information that was provided to Mr. Genovese, like Dr. Levine who had -- I'm told that he had a townhouse worth \$10 million in Tribeca, or maybe more than that. I don't know what has happened to that. Maybe that's been spent since he got sick.

But at the time he invested he had assets that were sufficient. He represented — and to some extent it was corroborated — to be able to take a loss like this. So to the extent that it's affecting their lives now, that may have happened between the time of their investment and now that they are in worse positions.

But if you look at it from my client's perspective, when he's taking money, if there's a person who came and said, this all my retirement savings, maybe he wouldn't have taken it because the regulations didn't allow it. Maybe he would have treated those funds differently and put them in a safer investment. But all these people said, essentially, that they

were, for lack of a better word, high rollers who can afford the risk. They took the risk and they lost their money. I just wanted to bring that to your Honor's attention.

The Pinterest shares that Mr. Orley, I think, talked about.

MR. LEVINE: Levine.

MR. EISEMANN: That Dr. Levine talked about.

He said that they were never there. It's not the information that I have. And, again, I couldn't tell you what's right or not because I haven't looked at it. But, according to my client, that offer was withdrawn. Probably had the same impact whether they were never there or they were withdrawn, but it's a little bit less culpable if that's the way it happened.

On the IRA, it's a very bad result that he had to pay the taxes on that, the city or state taxes, whichever one he had to pay. My understanding is that Mr. Genovese researched it, felt because Dr. Levine administered his own IRA that he had the power to put it into this fund and it would still be covered.

I don't know what the research showed. And who cares if you are Dr. Levine because the fact is that it wasn't supported by the research. But to the extent that Mr. Genovese rationalized taking it, he certainly made statements that were overblown from what he had done, but there is a kernel of

justification in his mind for doing that, and it's only a kernel because it doesn't justify the result that Dr. Levine experienced.

The Maserati that Mr. Genovese rented, he told me he rented that. He didn't own it. It doesn't appear in any of the assets in the presentence report about what he owns. He rented that a couple of times. I'm sure a lot of it was show. That's part of being a hedge fund manager, that you want to show that you are successful. I don't know how much it cost, but I don't think it was a substantial amount of money that went into renting that on a couple of occasions.

Mr. Beals at one point represented that he owned his house free and clear and had other assets that his wife had cashed out of her company. Again, I don't know the situation today, but at the time that Mr. Genovese took the money, or while he had the money, that was his understanding.

With respect to the Orleys -- and I know Mr. Orley has written this in his letter and has acknowledged it when he stood here -- they are suing -- when you're doing what the Orleys are doing, which is to try to recoup your losses, you look for the deep pocket. And one of the deep pockets that I know by speaking to their counsel is perhaps the malpractice policy of Schiavetta, who was the lawyer who worked with Mr. Genovese, maybe the partners of the law firm that he was in at the time.

And so it's important for Mr. Genovese to help, and I have been helping, as prior counsel helped, Mr. Orley to try to recoup his losses. There is no money in Mr. Genovese's pocket that he can come into and just give to Mr. Orley, but he can do what he can do, which he tried to do with his cooperation with the government on the criminal side, is to give as much information as he can about Mr. Schiavetta, the lawyer Schiavetta. I just spoke to his lawyer yesterday to try and get more information, and I had provided that information to them. Hopefully that will help. It's something. It's not everything, but it's something to try to recoup the losses.

That and the efforts that Mr. Genovese made to cooperate with respect to Mr. Schiavetta is worth factoring in, with all due respect. It is an effort he's making to make good on it. And the fact that the Orley's brother's lawyer doesn't face Rule 11 sanctions for making a case against the lawyer Schiavetta indicates that there is a basis to say that he was involved in it, and so we are doing our best to try to help on that front.

By the way, I'm told by my client right here that the trip to Colombia with Dr. Levine -- I forget -- with Mr. Orley was \$500, that my client hadn't paid, but it's \$500 that -- he didn't mention the amount when he spoke. My understanding, it was a small amount. I just don't want it to be left unaddressed that it was some large amount of money that he owed

for the trip. And if that's wrong, I apologize. That's my client's recollection of that.

I think I have addressed what I wanted to say to the victims on my own behalf and on behalf of Mr. Genovese.

Your Honor, turning to the more general arguments that I wanted to make -- I'm sorry. I'll make one other statement. There's another person in the room who is affected by this. Not just Mr. Genovese, who faces the loss of his liberty for an extended period of time, but his mother, who, as in all these offenses, especially when it comes to someone losing their life, everyone's family is affected by this.

So his mother, Mr. Genovese is the one that she's closest to, the one who provides her the most support. She's afraid of losing her son for a long period of time. That's an impact, as well as the impact on the victims.

Your Honor, as the judge, is going to take that into account as well and it is a very big thing. She flew all the way from Chicago. She is 75. Seventy-five may be the new 55, but she flew here all the way from Chicago to be with her son to show her support and to let your Honor that she cares about him. She's disappointed in what he did, of course, but she cares about him. And if he goes away for longer than I think the case warrants, that's another person who it will be a tragedy on.

I'm just going to go back over some of the history and

circumstances which I did not put in the letter. This was mostly new information. I may touch on other aspects of it.

My client worked for a number of years. It is easy to look at someone like Mr. Genovese and look at his criminal record, and your eyes start to glaze over if you see a number of priors and you don't pay strict attention to the years.

But there was a period of time from 2007 -- from the mid 2000s to the time he was arrested that he wasn't in classic trouble. I know that he committed this offense. It was in an effort to try to make a living at something he had been doing on his own. He had been trading on his own since he was 18 years old. He had some success in it. He had success in his hedge fund. When hedge funds started to get bigger as a result of Dodd-Frank being passed, that made it more advantageous from a tech standpoint.

THE COURT: I've got to interrupt you for a moment. You made this point in your letter submission as well, that he was doing things that were productive from the mid 2000s, yet he was extradited from Florida in the spring of 2005 to face charges here in New York that had been lodged against him in the spring of 2004, and he pled guilty and was sentenced to three to six years in prison. That was on August 5, 2005.

So I just can't square your observation that he was leading a productive life in the mid 2000s with his criminal history.

MR. EISEMANN: I'll try and see when he was released from that sentence. If you will give me a moment.

THE COURT: July 31, 2007.

MR. EISEMANN: Right. The point I was making was from 2007 to 2017, that period once he got out, that he was trying. It's tough with a criminal record to make the kind of progress in your employment front. My point is, I don't want to collapse that 10-year period and lose it and say, well, he did something bad in a decade that begins with two zero and we are at another decade beginning with two zero, so he has just had an endless string of criminal behavior.

As you get older you have to find other ways to support yourself. He didn't just support himself through criminal things. He was working. He had a variety of jobs. He was working at O'Hare Airport at one point. He was a person who was responsible when they were building terminal 5 at O'Hare to put together a database.

THE COURT: Where is that in the presentence report?

MR. EISEMANN: I know it's not there. I wasn't there
during the interview. This actually was when he was working as
a freelance database designer, so for himself. So he wasn't
really employed.

But for a year and a half he was, through a temp agency, assigned to help build this terminal at the airport, help in terms of, he was the person who ran the punch list so

that when contractors said, I've completed this work, I need to get paid, they would have to go through Mr. Genovese to make sure that the database reflected that that particular work they did was performed before they were paid.

So it's not like he was out there. I know it's not in the presentence report. I wasn't present during the interview, so I don't know what question was asked, why this was missed, but he did that for a year and a half.

So he was trying to make money legitimately. And when he was trading on his own he was making money legitimately on his own, and he saw this as a way to bring himself beyond the sort of 60, \$80,000 a year he might make as a day trader to be very successful, and he took a shortcut, a tragically terrible shortcut, but that's what he what doing, pursuing something he thought was going to be a legitimate way to make money, cutting some very bad corners along the way.

I'm trying to make the point that he's not been a person who has just been in and out of jail constantly and this is just but the latest episode. It is more nuanced than that. He was trying.

You've got letters saying he's a caring person. He went back and lived at home to take care of his father when he had cancer. Any child would do -- not any child. Some kids wouldn't do that. But he did that, took care of his father. Supported his mother.

You can't fault him for wanting to turn his life around and live the American dream. But you can fault him for making some selfish decisions to say he was going to lie about his background to be able to do that. If he didn't make those statements, he's entitled to try and he's entitled to fail. It's not a crime to fail in a hedge fund. It is a crime to lie to get the money to be put into it, and he did that.

He was laid off. He was working at -- during that freelance period he worked as a programmer at something called the Harlan School for the Arts in Chicago, and he tracked student records of what classes they took. He was in charge of that database. Again, I think that's when he was a freelancer.

He worked for the company. So if that's not in the presentence report --

THE COURT: Actually, that is in the presentence report. From 2007 to 2008 and it characterizes his work hours as "irregular."

MR. EISEMANN: I hope your Honor is not assuming that means that he was supposed to be regular, but, in fact, he was only irregular. To me it suggests that it was a part-time thing that didn't require him to be there all the time. We don't know anything other than what's in the narrative.

THE COURT: It's a narrative that he provided to probation.

MR. EISEMANN: But irregular would be his own

statement to them that it was irregular hours, not that it was 40 hours a week. I think it would be wrong to read into that that somehow he was remiss in his work and it shows that he has a spotty record because he worked at a job that required regular hours.

THE COURT: No. In other jobs he was perfectly capable of reporting that he worked 40 hours a week. Irregular means something far less to me than 40 hours a week, and he couldn't remember what his compensation was.

MR. EISEMANN: He tells me it was part time three days a week.

THE COURT: There you go.

MR. EISEMANN: Your Honor, there's enough here for you to factor in and to draw an inference that I think is not a warranted one, since it came from my client himself during his interview, to say that he worked irregular hours three days a week. Maybe that's the probation officer's --

THE COURT: The only reason I raise it, and it's a minor point and let's move on, is that you were suggesting that to say it's irregular, Judge, means, oh, it's 40 hours but not at regular times.

MR. EISEMANN: I didn't mean to say that.

THE COURT: That's the inference you were asking me to draw. I don't draw that inference, and the defendant has just confirmed why I would be wrong to draw that inference because

he only worked two days a week.

MR. EISEMANN: Three.

THE COURT: Three. I wish I could get a job like that.

MR. EISEMANN: I must have misspoken because -
THE COURT: Move on, please. You are chopping a lot
of chicken liver.

MR. EISEMANN: OK.

When he did get into the business here, he had studied options in college, taking classes in it. Brokerage houses gave tutorials in it. He had traded on his own coffee, soy beans, Swiss francs, and yen in options and equities.

The emails that are in the possession of the defense have screenshots of Bloomberg information screens with stocks on them and analysis of that. There were PowerPoint analysis put together by his company --

THE COURT: I've got to interrupt you again. I'm sorry. But there has to be a good-faith basis for you to make the argument that you just made that he studied options and finance in college.

First, you submitted his transcript from the Community College district number 508 in Chicago, which he did not complete a degree. And when I look at his grades, they are largely Ds, incompletes. Econ 1, he withdrew. Econ 2, he got a D. So please don't stand here and tell me that he studied

finance in college. The only course he seems to have done well in was in his first semester for one credit called career planning. Wow. I wonder what that course was about.

MR. EISEMANN: Then, your Honor, let's just look at the proof. I've given examples of the trades he did. Options are not for the faint of heart, and he had some very big successes. He had others I didn't put in there.

The investors here will know about something called an Alibaba, I think, that he made over a million dollars, and he invested a hundred thousand dollars in late 2014. Held options for two weeks. They rose from a dollar to about the price of \$19 and made a lot of money.

So whether it was acquired through formal education or watching brokerage things, or maybe I weighted too much what he did in college, he had enough knowledge to be able to do this.

The only point I'm trying to make, and maybe I'm making this harder for myself, is to say that he was trying and he often succeeded but he often failed. I guess I'll leave it at that. I don't need to give more than I put in the memorandum about that.

I've given you other cases, your Honor, where there are other losses much, much higher than this where the defendants received lower sentences than the guidelines recommends hear. All of them involved either a variance or a departure from the guidelines.

One of the things your Honor has to consider is, TO what extent did Mr. Genovese loot his own company for his own benefit? The most aggressive figure, the SEC says is \$200,000. The most aggressive figure I could come up with, and that is drawing all inferences against Mr. Genovese, this is on page 16 of my main sentencing submission, is about a million dollars.

I think that 400,000 of that is probably legitimately charged to the business expenses and entertaining clients. He may have done it lavishly, but there is an argument that they can be deductible in taxes. Maybe it is closer to 600,000, but it is certainly nowhere near the tens millions of dollars that people usurp for themselves in the cases I cited for your Honor. That is a mitigating factor because if he were a thief, he would have taken it all from the get-go because he was trying — he lost a lot, but of the losses, maybe, at most, 10 percent of the losses went into his own pocket. 90 percent of his losses were just through his efforts to trade that didn't work.

I'd like to turn just to the comparable cases, your Honor, unless you have questions about them. I understand every case as --

THE COURT: Every case requires an individualized assessment, doesn't it?

MR. EISEMANN: I understand. But every case, the rigidity of the guidelines and the overly formulaic way that

they operate and the mounting of various adjustments in there has no empirical evidence.

And like the defendant or not, it is your job, as a judge who's passing judgment on him, to say when you start the guidelines, as you should as the starting point, to say, now, under the Supreme Court line of cases to say, am I satisfied that that really reflects the punishment someone like that should get. If I couldn't make that argument I couldn't ask your Honor to go below the guidelines.

But you could personally despise Mr. Genovese. And if the guidelines still say that his sentence should be 70 months, for instance, and that's the heartland that you work from, you would do it because you would say, I don't like what he did, I find it painful. And if you're the victims, it's painful. But if the guidelines said that is the heartland, that would be your starting point.

My submission is geared towards telling you that the heartland should be around the five, six, seven-year range and not the 10-year range that the guidelines choose their application of, including one adjustment that I disagree with philosophically. Without that, you're in that range.

So the application of this one adjustment, for example, investment advisor adjustment, I think this is a case where over time, if it is litigated -- maybe your Honor felt we had to write on this to help advance it -- in time I think

there is going to be this argument that I have developed that may come to the forefront, and that is that investment advisor is construed broadly in the civil context and in the civil enforcement context, but the sentencing commission is just putting in a definition section that investment advisor under these guidelines has the same definition as it has under the Investment Advisors Act, that is just nothing to support that it should be read that way and it doesn't serve the purposes to read it broadly here. In fact, it jacks the sentence up by 50 percent to read it that way.

Again, it's understandable if you find Mr. Genovese's offenses to be unforgivable and yet still -- I'm just asking you not to be whipsawed by the guidelines, use of a four-point adjustment that I believe logically doesn't apply and shouldn't apply because it doesn't fit the definition except for the fact there are some cases construing it broadly in other contexts without any analysis. It's just been adopted by a couple of courts in here.

Mr. Genovese, for all he's done wrong, no one should be subjected to what he's been subjected to in his time at the local federal jails, and some of this is known. I just want to highlight some things which I didn't put in in detail in the letter. I didn't want to gild the lily, but I think I would like to gild it a little bit here and go over the impact that those things had on him.

He was part of the blackout at the MDC where the temperature was down as low as 13 degrees. There was no ventilation for 10 days or so at that temperature. Fans were still blowing without heat. The officers wouldn't let them turn off the fans. They wouldn't let them block the vents.

So they would be in their cells with nothing but their own body warmth for that period of time. He was given cold sandwiches. And maybe to the victims that feels like justice served, but that's not the way our society works. Only cold sandwiches. No liquids, no juice, no milk at breakfast, no bottles of water. They had to drink out of the sinks that had freezing cold water coming out of them.

After the blackout ended, by the way, they still didn't get bottled water for about another a week or 10 days. There was rusty water coming out of the taps, and they had to drink that. It was inhumane.

They didn't have any extra blankets. Mayor de Blasio arranged to have blankets brought to the jail, and the warden turned them away. And only through pressure by Mayor de Blasio did any of the inmates -- not just Mr. Genovese, but others -- get those.

They didn't get hot water, and they haven't had hot water even since, except maybe once a week. Maybe nine out of 10 showers they have to take are cold, and once in a while they get warm water, and right now the water is scalding hot.

It's not a well-run institution and it's not receptive to the problems that the inmates have unless the inmates somehow make it into a court where the judge takes personal interest in this, or maybe Judge Irizarry of the Eastern District or the Federal Defenders makes a bigger issue of it than they made of the blackout. It's a very difficult existence to be there.

There are frequent lockdowns out there at the MDC, where he is right now. The jails are fairly air tight. So they turn off the ventilation because if there is something involving noxious odors that's part of an incident on another floor, they'll turn off the ventilation so nobody gets it, so the lockdowns lasts for hours. I know because I have waited to see somebody at the jail for hours. They forget to turn the ventilation on afterwards. You have inmates locked in their cells that have black mold in the cells, with no ventilation, for hours and hours, and those lockdowns are becoming more frequent.

There's no razors being handed out for the last three months. Inmates can only buy them through commissary. Not everybody can afford to do that through the commissary. They are supposed to do that and give soap and shampoos every two months, but they're not doing that.

He's part of the lawsuit about what happened at the MDC in the blackout, and you're not allowed to be part of that

lawsuit, they won't take you unless you have an actual injury.

So Mr. Genovese had an injury from there. He has asthma. He came into it. He was at the MDC and the MCC. They both have black mold growing. It's a perennial problem there.

During the blackout my client developed a fever of 103 degrees. He was shivering from the cold. He was shivering from his fever, and they couldn't do anything about it. They wouldn't and they couldn't do anything about that. So he ended up getting full-blown pneumonia. He got x-rayed for that pneumonia. The x-ray showed calcified growth in his lung. It is not because of the pneumonia, but they happened to see it and it's been -- the blackout was over a year ago, two years ago at this point, and nothing has been done about that. He may have a growing cancer in him. I don't have to preach to your Honor about the terrible medical care that you get in both the institutions, but that is not what we want as a free society to do.

He has a torn ACL ligament that has not been treated for the whole time he's been there. He came in there with it. Finally, after nine months of having to climb up to the top bunk, they finally gave him a pass to be on the bottom bunk. It's just an example of the sort of callousness that the institutions have.

At the MCC there is rat feces there. They have to live in that. They can't control the rat problem. There is

mold everywhere. He was on 11 south. It had black mold. No vents.

The union officers, even at the MCC, sued the Bureau of Prisons because of the lack of ventilation because they have to work in the same environment. There are cockroaches swarming around there. There is ventilation in one unit. He was talking about 5 south that had ventilation, but no air conditioning, so it became sweltering hot.

I know your Honor has followed the cases that have come out of this, and I know you are aware that judges have granted some sort of consideration, a variance to account for the horror that all these people went through. They are captive, they can't leave, and I submit to you that is your role as a judge looking at the bigger picture. You should take that into account. Obviously, it's your call.

Can I have just a moment with my client?

THE COURT: A moment.

MR. EISEMANN: I just want to note initially that only has Mr. Genovese worked with the victims, or at least with the Orleys, counsel for the Orleys. He's available to work with anyone else. He has agreed to forfeiting property to help make restitution.

At the time of his initial presentment here in the Southern District of New York, he actually got bail set, and it would have required his mother to sign a \$500,000 personal

recognizance bond and probably pledged his property. I don't know. He decided to stay in and he told his counsel, it was Federal Defenders at that point, that he wasn't going to put his mother through it. I understand that the government had thoughts of maybe appealing that bail decision, but it's my understanding, because I did get this second hand, that Federal Defenders notified the government that Mr. Genovese was not going to sign the bond and sign himself out, so that became moot. So, in a sense, he punished himself right away to spare his mother to the victims who would have been galled to see him walking the street, maybe. He spared them that as well. So it's a little piece, but it's a piece that I put in for your Honor to consider.

Let me look at my notes. I think I am close to finishing.

On the technical aspects of the loss amount, I have spoken about this with Mr. Enzer. I know we don't see eye to eye on this. But to the extent that the guidelines are driven by the loss figure and that we jump into the category of \$9.5 million, I don't see any reason why the \$718,000 sitting in a TD Ameritrade account that was there. It would have been maybe \$600,000 greater had there been some more planning on the government, the SEC, and the FBI side, maybe the government, when he was arrested, because there were options that were expiring. I briefed your Honor about it.

To the extent that there still is \$718,000, I don't see any reason why that should not be taken off the loss figure. That doesn't bring it down to the next category, but if you then take off the profits that he would have made if the arrest had been handled a little differently, he gets close to that figure.

Then with the business expenses, I touched on this, but it's hard even for a hedge fund that loses money. An investor can't come and say to the hedge fund, I know that of the million dollars I gave you, \$150,000 went towards expenses over the five years that I was in the fund, I want that back. You're not entitled to that. There's a reasonable amount that no investor expects to get back because of commissions, because of management fees and because of the expenses of running the hedge fund. Everybody is in it together. If the hedge fund has to spend money on entertainment and other expenses — and now I'm just not talking about entertainment. I'm talking about things like legal expenses, accounting fees, web fees, hosting fees, all of the things I detailed in there.

THE COURT: Please. \$180,000 in legal fees? For what? To impede the SEC's investigation? I mean, look at the legal fee compared to the accounting fee for the three years the hedge fund was purportedly in business. \$1100 in accounting fees? You couldn't get an accountant to do your tax return for \$1100.

MR. EISEMANN: This is assuming that was all captured in the analysis done by Mr. Halperin's firm. I was trying to show you what I had documented.

THE COURT: I got it all.

MR. EISEMANN: The point is only the broader one.

Because if I'm going to come down to dollars, I'm not going to know enough to be able to answer a question like your Honor posed. By going up two levels, his sentence increases by two years or so, whatever I briefed your Honor on. Just advocating for a more measured approach than that and to understand that there is nothing about that magic jump point that makes him have to go up that much.

Just looking through my last set of notes, and I think I'll be done.

Your Honor, in sum, I hope that you will obviously take into account the powerful statements from all four of the investor victims who testified here, but that you will use your judgment and decide how much of that outweigh the countervailing arguments, particularly the ones about the arbitrariness of the guidelines, and look at the norms that have been established by other cases.

And with that, even if it's disappointing to the victims who are in court -- and I understand anything less than life or even less than the 10 years recommended by the guidelines will be disappointing -- that I hope your Honor

understands and that they will understand that your job is broader than just to listen to how they've been pained, and they have been pained and legitimately are angry, but there's a whole spectrum of facts, circumstances before you, and I hope that you'll use that to give a more modest sentence than the guidelines recommend.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Eisemann.

Mr. Enzer, does the government wish to be heard?

MR. ENZER: Yes, your Honor. Briefly.

I know your Honor is familiar with my sentencing submission and with the victim impact statements, so I'm not going to repeat what's in there.

I just want to address a few key points that the defense made, points that I think are drawn from Mr. Genovese's letter to your Honor.

Defense counsel has done the best he can with this record, he's been very effective, but there are certain arguments that he made to your Honor that are drawn directly from Genovese's letter that are either a fraud on this Court or reflect such a distorted view of reality that, either way, whether Mr. Genovese now is trying to lie to the Court or whether he is so delusional that he believes these claims, either way, he is a danger to the community, a danger to the public, the type of recidivist fraudster, conniving con artist, predator, be it a delusional one or an intentional one setting

out to deceive people, who needs to be incapacitated.

And that is one of the Section 3553(a) factors that your Honor must consider, that your Honor should appropriately consider. And regardless of what the guidelines are, they call for a very serious, severe sentence that will keep him incarcerated long enough to the point where he will not pose such a great danger.

And the facts on this point are very troubling because he embarked on this scheme in this case at the age of 50. That is a time when many offenders are aging out of crime. But for him, this was the greatest crime of his career as a con artist.

Your Honor knows he had nine prior convictions, several of them for fraud-related crimes. And after those, after multiple stints in prison, including a stint in prison for a sentence, the high end of which is longer than what the defendant is asking for now, he embarked on this elaborate scheme posing as a hedge fund magnate, telling a web of lies to convince people, using expenditures of money, money stolen from his victims, to support the elaborate claims of fraud. And as the scheme continued over time, creating fake documents, fake account statements, to sell the lie to victims.

One of the central tenets of the defendant's letter to your Honor is that he didn't set out to do this crime, that he thought this was just a threshold lie about his background, and that he was actually going to do a great job for his victims,

his clients, and that he had no intention of wasting their money, and it's just really market losses that caused his loss. That's in his letter. I'm paraphrasing. His words: I thought it was a harmless lie, only a threshold falsehood that would get my business going. That is unsupported by the facts in this case.

Here are the facts. I'm basing this not only on records that were produced to the defense, but a summary analysis that we provided to defense counsel of the losses that Mr. Genovese incurred.

In 2015, the first year of the fraud, he lost \$266,918. 2016, the second year, \$4,179,999 was his trading loss. 2017, his trading loss was 3.7 million.

It is not as though he took all of the investor money at one moment, traded it and then lost it. What happened is that he told lies, got money in, spent some of it on trading and lost it, spent some of it on lavish expenses that your Honor has heard about, and I will account some of them in a moment.

Then, when he needed more, he told more lies to more victims. So as an example, Dr. Levine, who your Honor heard from, he was recruited into this fraud in 2017. That is after more than 4 million in losses had already been incurred by Mr. Genovese.

At that moment, when he decided to tell Mr. Levine a

series of lies about his personal qualifications, this was no longer a threshold lie as part of a good-faith effort to test out his personal trading skills. He knew at that point his personal skills, if there were any, had failed. He had lost millions. And, yet, he lied about his qualifications to get Mr. Levine to give his money. And he provided documents with fake account numbers about his returns. He gave them a document representing that one of his hedge funds had quarterly returns varying from 4 to 18 percent.

Mr. Genovese says in his letter to your Honor that there is boilerplate disclosures. He says: My subscription agreements contained standard boilerplate language which made clear that our fund had no track record and that investors should be prepared to lose everything.

Boilerplate language is not an excuse when you know of facts to the contrary. His boilerplate — in addition to the boilerplate, he had marketing materials he gave to Mr. Levine that said risk level with a scale of one to 10, and he had a red circle around one putting his fund, one of his funds, at the lowest risk level. You don't get to put generic boilerplate language in while simultaneously misrepresenting this is a low-risk investment.

MR. EISEMANN: May I take a look at that. Thank you.

MR. ENZER: Mr. Genovese says he doesn't think he can fairly be blamed entirely for all the losses.

His lies concealed a risk. What they concealed was that he was incompetent and incapable of managing these people's money and that he would steal a significant portion of it, and that risk materialized. He is absolutely responsible. Market losses are not.

And as a frame of reference, your Honor, according to one commonly used hedge fund index, the HFRI, fund weighted composite index, the hedge funds that are encompassed within that index, in the years in question, 2015, 2016, 2017, grew at 12 percent, 13 percent, 14 percent, compared to an \$8.2 million loss.

Separate and apart from the money he lost, he spent a significant amount on his own lavish expenses. You have heard some of that from the victims, and I've documented some of it in the government's sentencing submission.

The defense does not seriously dispute, if you look at the numbers in their two sentencing submissions, that at least a million was spent by the defendant on inappropriate expenses, what I'm calling luxury items. That's a million dollars over the course of two years, 500,000 each year. He was not entitled to do that. That is an example of greedy behavior. It is aggravating. And it goes to why he is a predator, it goes to why he is a danger, and it goes to why a serious sentence is warranted here.

Some of that money, 448,000 was spent on boats,

according to the defense's analysis. According to records the government produced, \$77,000 was spent on a private jet company that the defendant used to travel in. He had not given returns to investors that warranted these kind of expenditures. A responsible money manager wouldn't do that. This is the behavior of a con artist stealing from his clients.

Much of the expenses that the defense characterizes as legitimate business expenses are really expenses that go to the fraud, like spending over \$400,000 on office space. The purpose behind that is so that you can have meetings with victims to convince them of the con. That is not a legitimate business expense, especially when the defendant, when he raised money from victims, he told them what he would take out of their money as a fee was 2 percent a year, unless he had great success, which he never did. 2 percent a year. Generous to the defendant?

If you take 2 percent times two years of the scheme out of 11 million, that comes to about 448,000. That is the most that could possibly have been expected by the victims in terms of money that would have gone into his pocket for the management of this hedge fund. The rest of it is misappropriated, under his own representations.

Your Honor, the factors that are relevant here, the first is that this is an egregious and troubling predatory scheme. Because of that, the serious of the offense warrants a

sentence at the high end of the guidelines range, which is what the government is asking for. The guidelines range, there is no dispute here, is 121 to 151 months. That comes out to roughly 10 to 12 and a half years. Probation has recommended a sentence of 132 months, or 11 years.

And probation is an independent arm of the Court. They did their own investigation. They see cases day in and day out. They have the ability to compare offenders that they interview and make determinations about how one person stacks up to another. Their recommendation is 132 months. We submit it should be higher. But, in any event, it certainly should not be below guidelines. It shouldn't be five years, what the defense has asked for, a sentence that is lower than the last sentence the defendant got in some of his New York State convictions.

The history and characteristics of the defendant. As your Honor has heard, he's had virtually no legitimate employment over the course of his adult life. And that is not a product of a bad upbringing. He grew up in a relatively privileged upbringing. We have set that forth in our submission. The facts of it are in the presentence report.

Compared to the average defendant who appears before your Honor, he had extreme privilege growing up. There was no reason he needed to turn to crime and certainly no reason he needed to embark on this fraud after the nine other convictions

he had, and yet he did anyway. That tells you a lot about who he is, his history, his characteristics. He is someone who is either evil or completely deluded. Either way, he is the type of danger to the community that needs to be incarcerated for a very, very long period of time.

He has said that he has had success in day trading. That appears to be based only on Mr. Genovese and nothing else.

Finally, your Honor, deterrence and the need to protect the public. Deterrence generally is important. It is important for the public and for anyone who would emulate Mr. Genovese to know that a recidivist con artist with nine convictions doesn't get to fleece a bunch of other victims and walk out of here with a light sentence. And it's important to deter him because he has demonstrated, through his conduct over the course of his adult life, that no prison sentence, no supervision is going to stop him unless it's serious. None of the other ones did. It's important that this sentence stop him in his tracks.

He's now 54. He is just as capable today of spinning lies to raise money. Only a serious and long sentence has a chance of putting a stop to him, at least until he gets out again.

With that, your Honor, I'll sit down.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Enzer.

MR. EISEMANN: Can I reply briefly to the government's

argument?

THE COURT: Two minutes. All right. The record should reflect that you already have addressed the Court for just shy of an hour. Mr. Enzer just addressed the Court for 10 minutes.

MR. EISEMANN: I'll take two minutes, your Honor.

THE COURT: That's all I'm giving you.

MR. EISEMANN: Give or take a few seconds.

The government uses rhetoric: Danger to the community, predator. It's all rhetoric, your Honor.

The fact is that on supervision Mr. Genovese could be controlled, to the extent that he's out there. He's not someone who can't be monitored. It's a fallacious argument.

Retribution I understand. That aspect I understand.

Not because he's a danger to the community. He said he started a scheme at 50. I addressed this. He started a scheme that despite everything he did to keep it going — and that's not an unusual thing that happens in fraud cases. The fraud gets perpetuated by more fraud to keep it going. When it started to fail he still set out to do a legitimate thing and it's still proven by the fact that he invested.

The statement, the bold statement that he was either incompetent or incapable of investing the money, the track record doesn't show that he had some superior skill in it, but it also doesn't show that other hedge funds that were doing the

same types of tradings were losing money.

There were other hedge funds besides the ones in the index that Mr. Enzer purports that went belly up, big hedge funds that failed. These were spectacular failures and it wasn't because everybody was a criminal going into it. It is because it's a very risky thing to go in and trade on options, and it didn't work out.

But for the fact that there was fraud to get the money, he wouldn't be prosecuted for it not working out. It just meant that either market forces did it, or he wasn't as good as others, and there are some aspects he's touched on in his letter to your Honor about why it didn't work out. He's admitting there was inexperience he had, that if he had, for instance, a dedicated broker in there, he could have executed trades faster, wouldn't have been at the whim of the market. There were things he did wrong, but that doesn't make everything a fraud.

The million dollars, just in terms of money that was taken out, that's the maximum figure. I'm asking your Honor to assume that to be true and yet still follow my guidelines arguments.

Our position is, about \$600,000 of that is probably fairly characterized as Mr. Enzer did, but 400,000 is not.

He's entitled to take out \$400,000 over the two years using the 2 percent rule, which is standard in the industry. He's making

200,000 over that. Maybe he is 600,000 over it. That's not our position, and we are not conceding that point.

The last point I'll make is that in saying that he turned to crime at 50, I won't belabor the point that he was turning to a threshold and then a perpetuating lie to do something he thought would make a legitimate living for him.

You have a report from a psychiatrist talking about the factors that also drove him to do this. It's not an abuse excuse. It's simply a fact that not everybody goes into things with venality, and Mr. Genovese did not go into this with venality. There were certainly selfishness in it in the decisions he made, but it is not as if he were some pathological, amoral, incapable of doing anything other than preying on victims and intending to steal their money. That's not the situation you have, and, with all due respect, I think you shouldn't sentence him as if it were.

THE COURT: Mr. Eisemann, does your client wish to address the Court before sentence is imposed?

MR. EISEMANN: Briefly.

THE COURT: He can do so from counsel table and he can remain seated. If you would pull the microphone toward him so that everyone in the courtroom can hear.

THE DEFENDANT: Excuse me, your Honor. I've got an upper respiratory infection right now.

I want to touch on two things. The smallest of

importance first and then the biggest importance last.

The first thing I wanted to address is something you've brought up several times that I've been in court, including today with much colorful admonition.

The good thing is that my mother is here today to attest to the truth and veracity of what I'm going to say.

That is, my first counsel, Sabrina Shroff, who was only my lawyer for one or two appearances, we removed because my family offered to help me out with counsel.

Then we hired Mr. Little. Mr. Little, as you well know, was not prepared for sentencing just before the blackout occurred or right after. I don't recall. The bottom line is, Mr. Little defrauded my mother of tens of thousands of dollars by not performing the work. I have numerous emails begging him to do the job that he did not do, and we will address that in a civil matter later on.

The other matter I wanted to bring up is Mr. Halperin. He was referred to us through my mother's attorney in Chicago, and we thought he was an immensely qualified person and, sadly, he defrauded my mother of tens of thousands of dollars as well. On top of that, there is some fraudulent billing that we are claiming, some massive fraudulent billing that is unsubstantiated by Mr. Halperin, and we will address that.

That's where the delays have been and why I've had to change counsel, because none of them have been up to the job.

And, sadly, my mother, being 75 years old, my father passing away, she is living on a fixed income and that money she could have used in her retirement, and now she's living week by week because of the money she had to pay out, the over a hundred thousand dollars in real money that she's had to pay.

But the main point I wanted to address to your Honor is to give you the courtesy — because you're not a mind reader. You're a very smart guy, but you are not a mind reader. That is, my two previous counsels were completely not up to the job, and they were very disingenuous with you, and there was not much I could do other than listen to their constant promises that were not fulfilled for me. I apologize for any misunderstanding you might have in that.

Unfortunately, my mother is suffering greatly from this and, of course, my case is suffering because you think it might be some kind of scheme or something, and I think we are all frustrated by it, including myself, and I know you are, and I apologize to you for that. I apologize to the government and to everyone else, that it was not our intent to waste money and waste the Court's time.

With that, I would like to move onto the more important issue. And, that is, I'd like to address the Court. I would like to thank your Honor for the courtesy. I'm not much of a public speaker, but I'm going to try and put forth my thoughts from my heart.

I said a lot in my letter to you, your Honor, and I think a lot -- I'm going to diverge from this, what I wrote, a little bit because we do have some ex-clients here today. And I'm not going to look at them, but I want to say that for them to say that they think that our friendship was a fraud is wrong, and that I loved them then, I love them today, and I think that I'm very hurt by that feeling. But I take full responsibility for how they feel and what I've done, and I have allocuted that, and I admitted to that. And I wanted to say that I apologize to them from my heart. And I know that's not going to bring back money or anything from what I've done.

I want to apologize to my mother as well for putting her through this.

I want to apologize to the SEC and the government, the FBI.

But, more importantly, and number one, I want to apologize to the victims, that they entrusted me with their money, and I broke that trust. I want to make that very clear, that that's the number one thing in my mind right now.

Thank you very much, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

The defendant, Nicholas Genovese, comes before this Court having pled guilty to securities fraud, a serious crime against the United States that strikes at the heart of our nation's financial system.

This Court reviewed the presentence investigation report. I adopt the findings of fact in the report as amended today on the record as my own, and I will cause the presentence report to be docketed and filed under seal as part of the record in this case after I receive counsel's joint letter regarding the specific changes that were discussed on the record here earlier today.

Turning to the guidelines calculation, this case sounds in fraud, and so the base offense level is 7. Because the total loss from the offense is more than \$9,500,000 but less than \$25 million, 20 levels are added.

Because this crime involved 10 or more victims and resulted in substantial financial hardship to one or more victims, a further two-level enhancement is warranted. And because the offense involved a violation of the securities law, and at the time the defendant was an individual holding himself out as a broker or dealer or investment advisor, a further four-level enhancement is appropriate under the guidelines.

Now, Mr. Genovese, did come forward before the Court and plead guilty. Accordingly, I grant him a three-level reduction for acceptance of responsibility, and so that yields a total offense level of 30.

Now, considerable ink was spilled in the parties' presentence submissions concerning the defendant's criminal history. Suffice it to say, for the purposes of this record,

this Court finds that his criminal history was properly calculated by probation and yields a criminal history category of III. So with a total offense level of 30 and a criminal history category of III, the defendant's guideline range is 121 to 151 months of imprisonment.

Now, of course, as the parties have acknowledged in their arguments, the guidelines are a starting point for the Court's consideration here. The defendant argues for a substantial variance down from the guideline range. The government urges the Court to sentence Mr. Genovese at the top of the guideline range.

Mr. Genovese's fraudulent scheme unraveled when the SEC examiners went to Willow Creek's offices at One Liberty Plaza in late December 2017 to perform a surprise site visit. Mr. Genovese refused to let the SEC examiners into Willow Creek's office space. And later that day the SEC formally advised Mr. Genovese and his hedge fund that they were the subject of an SEC investigation. The SEC issued a subpoena compelling Mr. Genovese to appear for a deposition on January 30, 2018.

When Genovese failed to appear, the FBI opened a parallel criminal investigation and, on February 1, 2018, attained an arrest warrant for Genovese.

On February 2, FBI agents located and arrested Genovese while he was sitting in a vehicle at a Starbucks

parking lot in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. During a search of the vehicle, the agents discovered \$148,000 in cash, travel bags, and luggage, Mr. Genovese's passport, and his dog.

Since that time, he's been detained. From early 2015 until his arrest, Mr. Genovese raised millions of dollars from victims for investments in Willow Creek Advisors by making fraudulent misrepresentations about his background, his professional qualifications, by concealing that he had a number of prior felony convictions for fraud-related claims, that he had previously filed for bankruptcy, a whole litany of misrepresentations and omissions.

How Mr. Genovese managed to fly under the radar of securities regulators and trusting investors for so long is a difficult question to answer. Perhaps it's because he is a serial fraudster who knows how to manipulate people and the system.

In any event, were it not for the quick work of SEC and law enforcement agents, this Court has no doubt that Mr. Genovese would have fled the country.

Securities fraud is a crime that screams for general deterrence. If swindlers think that they can get away with it, innocent investors and hard-working individuals are the ones who suffer.

As the victim-impact statements that were submitted to the Court and the poignant remarks by various investor victims

here today make clear, many trusting and decent individuals have been deeply injured by Mr. Genovese's fraud, and a number of them may not recover from their financial and psychological losses.

There's also a compelling need for specific deterrence because Mr. Genovese is a serial fraudster. He has 17 arrests and nine convictions dating back to December 1989, when he was only 24. Virtually all of them relate to fraud of one kind or another, with the dollar amounts escalating each time.

It appears to me that he became quite an expert at credit card fraud and sentences of 10 months in prison and 30 months in prison didn't deter him.

Then he graduated to fraudulent schemes on eBay that led to a sentence here in New York of three to six years prison.

And of course there was his scheme to sublet an apartment in Manhattan on Craigslist to multiple individuals in which he collected more than \$20,000 for an apartment he himself was not paying rent on and was prohibited from subletting.

As I've previously indicated in a question to counsel, in 2005, he earned the distinction of being extradited from Florida to face arrest warrants here in New York that had been issued nearly a year earlier.

His prior arrests and convictions are relevant to this

Court's individualized assessment under 3553(a). Mr. Genovese has assembled quite a body of work as a fraudster and the need for specific deterrence is compelling given that prior terms of imprisonment do not have appear to have dissuaded him from further criminal conduct.

Now, in the submissions Mr. Genovese's attorney and forensic psychologists suggest that his criminal conduct stems from his lack of self-esteem and his personal disappointment that his grandfather did not give him a manufacturing business in Chicago and chose instead to sell it to a third party. This Court cannot swear that assessment with the facts.

Mr. Genovese was raised in a firmly middle-class environment. His mother and father provided a caring home for him, and his mother continues to worry about him and provides support, even though he's now almost 55. Unlike many defendants who come before this court, Mr. Genovese had abundant opportunities to make something of himself and become a productive member of society.

His conduct at Willow Creek suggests anything but someone who lacks self-esteem. He exuded self-confidence, renting Maseratis when he visited clients in Los Angeles, cruising with clients in his Mahogany power boats on Lake George, dropping \$50,000 on a table at a New York Philharmonic fundraiser, and wining and dining people wherever he went.

Of course, to those investors, I guess it all looked

great, but little did they know it was all their money.

Indeed, even in Mr. Genovese's letter to this Court for sentencing he immodestly says that he thinks he was "talented, but recognizes that talent alone wasn't enough."

The reality is that he had no idea what he was doing investing, but it was all just a great ride for him.

He argues that the loss amount should be reduced because he didn't steal it; he just lost almost all of it in the market. Defendant's arguments are galling.

First, Genovese suggests that but for his arrest, he would have made an additional and \$526,195 on Facebook options that he purchased on January 31, 2018, after he failed to appear for a deposition and knew the weight of the federal government was coming down on him.

The defense attributes this 526,000 loss not to Mr. Genovese, but because of the unfortunate timing of his arrest and the apparent lack of planning by law enforcement on how to handle an account that likely contained time-sensitive options with hundreds of thousands, or perhaps millions, of dollars at risk." Talk about chutzpah.

Two days after he purchased the options he was arrested in an automobile in Florida with \$148,000 in cash. Only Mr. Genovese knows what his travel plans were, but they certainly didn't include exercising an option for the benefit of his investors at the optimal moment.

His other arguments have also been thoroughly considered and lack merit. The notion that the business of Willow Creek was legitimate turns the world upside down.

What are the legitimate expenses of a fraudulent investment company? 180,000 in legal expenses to keep regulators at bay, and only \$1100 in accounting fees, \$18,000 a month for an office. None of it makes any sense.

What does make sense is that he used Willow Creek investors' money for his own personal gratification and was totally reckless, spending more on power boats than anything else. None of it warrants any reduction in the loss amount.

I mean, among the misrepresentations, Mr. Genovese concealed his criminal record, and prior bankruptcy, claimed to have graduated from Dartmouth's school of business and to hold a finance degree from the University of Kentucky, and to have been a partner at Goldman Sachs and a portfolio manager at Bear Stearns, and that he had the backing of the Genovese drugstore chain fortune. He never had any of that, and he told at least one victim that he managed a \$30 billion fund and another victim that his returns were between 30 and 40 percent.

It was all a fraud. Defense counsel's reliance on a couple of decisions by other judges to grant dramatic variances from the sentencing guidelines are not persuasive.

The law requires a judge to make an individualized assessment of a defendant. And to cite cases where defendants

had no criminal history and whose lives were otherwise marked by good works is just not relevant to Mr. Genovese. Those individuals in the cases cited by counsel are unlikely to recidivate, a conclusion that this Court cannot draw with respect to Mr. Genovese given his 30-year history of fraud. This Court is concerned that when Mr. Genovese is released from prison he'll concoct another more outrageous scheme because that's been his trajectory for the last 30 years.

In short, he is a danger to the community, truly a predator, unlike any I've encountered in more than 21 years on the bench.

Now, looking at his history and characteristics and, as I said, the compelling need for specific deterrence here, I find that a sentence within the guideline range is entirely appropriate. And weighing all the material that's been put before this Court, I'm now prepared to impose sentence on the defendant, and I'd ask him to stand.

Mr. Genovese, I don't know whether the sentence I'm about to impose is going to deter you from future conduct. I hope so, but I don't know.

It's my judgment, sir, that you be sentenced to a term of 140 months of imprisonment, to be followed by three years of supervised release, subject to all the standard conditions of supervised release, and the following special conditions that I'll impose on you in a moment.

I'm also going to enter an order for restitution in the amount of \$11,211,704. I'm going to also impose the mandatory special assessment. And I'll enter an order of forfeiture that I understand the government will be handing up.

As for the special conditions of supervised release,
I'm going to require to you provide access to any requested
financial information, not to incur any new credit card charges
or open additional lines of credit without the approval of your
probation officer unless you're in compliance with the
installment payment schedule that I'm going to fix.

You'll participate in an outpatient treatment program approved by probation to include testing to determine whether you've reverted to using drugs or alcohol, and I'll require to you contribute to the cost of services rendered based on your ability to pay and the availability of third-party payments. In that regard I authorize the release of available drug treatment evaluations and reports, including the presentence investigation report, to the substance abuse treatment provider.

Fourth, I'm going to require you to submit your person, residence, place of business, vehicle, and any property or electronic devices under your control to a search on the basis that your probation officer has a reasonable suspicion that contraband or evidence of a violation of the conditions of your release may be found. That search may be conducted at a

reasonable time and in a reasonable manner, and you're failure to submit to such a search may be grounds for revocation. You must inform any other residents of the premises where you reside upon your release that those premises may be subject to search pursuant to this condition.

Fifth, you are not to own or have any control of any business that functions as an investment hedge fund or investment advisory firm, nor are you to be employed or act in any capacity or represent yourself as a financial advisor, fund manager, securities trader, or financial broker.

With respect to restitution, I'm requiring you to pay

15 percent of your gross monthly income towards the

satisfaction of restitution.

Now, this Mr. Genovese constitutes the sentence of this Court. I advise you that to the extent you've not previously waived your right to appeal, you have the right to appeal. I advise you further that if you cannot afford counsel, counsel will be provided to you free of cost.

Mr. Eisemann has done an excellent job representing you, but, quite frankly, sir, you didn't give him much to work with.

You are going to go away now for a well-deserved term of imprisonment. And when you're released on supervised release, God willing, I'll still be sitting right here. And if you violate the terms of your supervised release and are

brought back, I can assure you, sir, that whatever the maximum statutory sentence is that I can impose for a violation of supervised release, I will impose it. So don't put yourself in the position of coming back before me. And maybe, for the first time in your life, when you get out, you could get an honest job and actually tell the truth when you talk to people about anything.

You may be seated.

Is there anything any further applications?

MR. ENZER: Nothing further from the government, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Eisemann?

MR. EISEMANN: A few, your Honor.

The restitution amount. The 15 percent, can that be after his release so that he — the meager amount he makes in jail to pay for commissary, things like that, doesn't get applied towards restitution. It's not going to make much of a difference to the victims.

THE COURT: I will grant that application.

MR. EISEMANN: In terms of a recommended designation, his mother is the person who will be coming to visit him. I think he is eligible for a camp because he has less than 10 years to go. She can't see him. The closest one to Chicago I think is in South Dakota, and that's a long drive for her. In looking to find institutions that are easily accessible from

airports, a flight from Midway to Baltimore is an easy flight for her to make, and there is a camp at Cumberland, FCI Cumberland. That also happens to have a residential drug treatment program, which I'm going to ask your Honor to recommend for Mr. Genovese. So I'm asking if you could make a recommendation that he be designated to that institution and also that he be in a residential drug treatment program.

THE COURT: First, I don't make the recommendation to the Bureau of Prisons about any specific institution. That is a security decision that only the Bureau of Prisons can make.

I will recommend that he be housed at a facility as close to the Baltimore area as possible, and I will make a recommendation that he be considered for the drug treatment program.

MR. EISEMANN: Thank you.

One other thing, your Honor. This is still uncharted waters for me somewhat.

The Second Chance Act I think allows your Honor at the time of sentencing to recommend an additional six months of either halfway house or home confinement to help integrate someone into society, and I'd ask that you make that recommendation, to the extent have you the power to do it, so the Bureau of Prisons can consider that. I believe it's a warden's call, but they will be guided by your recommendation.

THE COURT: No, I'm not going to make that

25

1 recommendation. He needs to be out of society, period. 2 MR. EISEMANN: OK. Nothing further, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: All right. This matter is concluded. 4 MR. EISEMANN: Your Honor, one application. His 5 mother has not seen him in a long time. She's here in the 6 courtroom. If the marshals would permit it, can he be at the 7 rail and give her a hug? THE COURT: No. That's a security issue. I am not 8 9 going to direct the marshals to do that. 10 MR. EISEMANN: May I have a moment to ask them if 11 they'll do it? 12 THE COURT: No. The marshals take directions from the 13 judge. It's a security issue. 14 I regret it. I feel sorry for his mother. His mother 15 is obviously suffering, like victims suffer. I know from her own letter to me that she knew nothing of what Mr. Genovese was 16 17 up to until she got a message from the Bureau of Prisons 18 inviting her to join the chats so that she could communicate 19 with her son. That was the first that she heard about his 20 arrest. 21 She has every reason to be disappointed in him. I'm 22 sure she loves him, but he hasn't done much to earn that. 23 (Adjourned)